

REMARKS

In the Board's decision of February 12, 2007, the Board sustained the rejection of claims 1-4, 6, 7, 8, 27, 28, 52, 54, 56 and 58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over de Marcken and Karch and of claims 55 and 59 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over de Marcken, Karch and Iyengar.

The Board however reversed the examiner's rejection of claims 53 and 57 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over de Marcken and Karch.

The Board held:

As to claims 53 and 57, the appellant argues that the art fails to show basing values for a requirement template on candidate set of travel options (Br. 14). The examiner responds that Karch teaches putting requirements in templates. While we agree that is indeed what Karch teaches, claims 53 and 57 go further in requiring that the requirements are the result rather than the source of the options. Neither DeMarcken nor Karch teach this. Therefore, we find the examiner's arguments to be unpersuasive.

Applicant has amended claims 52 and 56 to incorporate the allowable claims 53 and 57 into their respective claims. Thus, claim 52, as amended now recites: "... establishing a plurality of travel requirement templates, and for each travel requirement template, defining a plurality of travel requirements, each of the plurality of travel requirements corresponding to a different value of the respective travel requirements with values for a particular travel requirement template based on the candidate set of travel options"

Thus, Applicant's claims 52 and 57 and claims dependent thereon are now allowable.

Applicant has made a similar amendment to claim 1. As amended, claim 1 now recites: "a requirements generator module to generate a set of diverse travel requirements, by establishing a plurality of travel requirement templates, and for each travel requirement template, defining a plurality of travel requirements corresponding to different values of the travel requirements with values for a particular travel requirement template based on a candidate set of travel options" Given that no combination of the references applied by the examiner taught this feature, claim 1 and thus its respective dependent claims are also allowable.

Applicant has also added new claims 60-73 which depend from allowable claims 52 or 57 and are allowable at least for the reasons given by the Board. Moreover, these claims are fully supported in Applicant's specification and are derived from claims 2-8.

In view of the foregoing, applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance and such action is requested at the examiner's earliest convenience.

All of the dependent claims are patentable for at least the reasons for which the claims on which they depend are patentable. Canceled claims, if any, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

Denis G. Maloney
Reg. No. 29,670